

Exhibit A pg 3 paragraph 0009) Furthermore Tsujioka states “this invention can be used for a paper knife, earpick or scissors (See Exhibit A pg 4 paragraph 0016). Though Edmark’s invention does teach a rounded cylindrical probe, to make Tsujioka’s probe cylindrical would be contrary to using this device as paper knife, ear pick or scissors.

Tsujioka’s claims section (See Exhibit A pg 2) describe Edmark’s invention. This is a possible explanation as to why Tsujioka’s invention was not patentable. There is no disclosure in Tsujioka’s claims of a **pinched** “hair run-through-hole” designed to securely hold sections of hair as described in Applicant’s invention. Tsujioka’s discloses an invention with alternative embodiments of several **“hair run-through-hole section”** with drawing 8 having a crown like a “convex ring (See Exhibit A pg 4 paragraph 15 and pg 5). Tsujioka’s claim six - “implement according to claim 1 the number of said hair **run-through-hole** sections is two” -does describe a pinched section but a loop or open section which allow the “hair” to “run through hole”, not secure or hold the hair in the hole while forming this low looping numbered temporary hairstyle. Tsujoika and Edmark’s invention both demonstrate their devices in straight hair. Why, because their inventions are woefully inadequate when it comes to kinky textured African hair. Edmark’s invention currently marketed as the topsy tail states “Great for all hair types- from extra curly to pin straight” (See Exhibit B pg 1) and shows only one African American model with straightened hair (See Exhibit B pg 2.) Applicant’s invention forms multiple tight loops to create the dreadlocks hairstyle. Exhibit C shows a side by side depiction of Applicant’s and Edmark’s invention. Exhibit D is a mannequin head with African textured hair demonstrating the tight loops formed by the applicant’s tool (the thin braids)a nd the three loose loops formed by Edmarks invention.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, applicant submit that the claims are now in proper form and claims define patent ability over the prior art. Applicant has also included documents which support its novelty, unobvious -ness, and patentably over prior art. Therefore Applicant submit this application is now in condition for allowance, which action we now respectfully submit.

If for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully request the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. s 2173.02 and s 707.07 (f) in order that the applicant can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without need for further proceedings.

Very respectfully,



Debra Belton

Applicant Pro Se

Enclosed Exhibits A-D

15183 Chamisal

Chesterfield, MO 63017

636-720-0191